

MONTANA SHARED CATALOG
Executive Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 28, 2008
Via teleconference

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Beth Chestnut, Kim Crowley, Roberta Gebhardt, Claire Morton, Ann Rutherford, Joanne Erdall, Dawn Kingstad**

MEMBERS ABSENT:

MSC STAFF PRESENT: **Ken Adams, Jemma Hackbarth, Sarah McHugh**

The meeting convened at 10:10 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the October 2nd meeting in Missoula were approved as presented.

MSC STAFFING:

Ken presented his paper. Claire had a question on the Network Manager position and 40% of his time being devoted to MSC. Ken clarified that Mike really spends about 70-80% of his time. Claire also had a question about the \$9,000 in money from MSL, is this one time only money? Ken clarified that yes it is one time money. Sarah presented Bob's advice. He feels that it should be fulltime instead of part-time and wanted to remind everyone that this would occur under the state, and the broadband structure. Sarah felt that the projected chart percentages should be moved. She feels that there should be a shift of admin from 5 to 10 % and shift meetings down from 15 to 10%, also shift training up to 50% and support down to 20%. Roberta asked for clarification on number 6 and the EPS money. Ken clarified that none of these sources of funds would be completely used. Claire agreed that the money for EPS should not be used for this purpose, as it already has a purpose. Claire mentioned that people from the membership would like to see someone who is a cataloger in this position. Sarah thinks we need to get costs from Sirsi for Enterprise. She agrees that a person with cataloging is a great suggestion, but in the long term should be very well rounded in all areas. Jemma pointed out that she has cataloging experience, but does not have time to do this. Sarah reminded everyone that ¾ of catalog cleanup can be done through automated processes. Claire stated that we need clear feedback from Sirsi on the price structure. We need to pursue getting something from Sirsi in writing and to know what has happened to the Montana Formula. Ken has not talked to Rick Branham. Sarah thinks that we need to talk to Rick. Ann feels that a fulltime person is a good idea and that changing the percentages like Sarah suggested is a good idea. Ann asked for clarification for the 25% of non-MSC duties. Ken responded that this is specific to Mike and the time he spends on other projects for the State Library. Ann has heard that small libraries in Eastern Montana are pushing for a person at the State Library that is funded by LSTA that supports non-MSC libraries. She wanted us to know that there is other talk out there about what LSTA funds

should be used for. Beth agreed that a fulltime person is needed. Claire asked Ken for a draft budget including a new person for the next year. Ken clarified that part-time person would get full state benefits, so it would be more expensive to have a part-time employee.

ACTION – Ken will give us a draft budget for next year with new person included for the next meeting.

CATALOG CLEAN-UP:

Roberta reported that the last week has been spent running reports to get an idea of where we are in the catalog. Mike believes that there are about 5,000 duplicate OCLC numbers in the system. Another report that looked at records without a 035 tag showed that there are about 40,000 of these records in the system. Roberta suggested that when the records without a 035 tag are down to a manageable level that a report be run every month that is given back to the libraries that have records without a 035 tag.

Sarah thinks that there are several steps that should be taken. Sarah talked about the process that was undertaken in 2005 to merge records with OCLC numbers. OCLC returned a file that had 035 tags that were then merged into the records in the catalog. After this was complete, they worked with Sirsi to change the match point in the system to the 035 tag. Sarah mentioned some other tools to use instead of focusing on manual clean-up. 1. The Shared Catalog is on a yearly addition of new libraries. For libraries that are migrating records, propose looking at different options. In the white paper by Jennie Stapp written in 2005, scenarios 3 and 4 are pertinent to this situation. Records would be extracted from the old system and sent to OCLC. OCLC would match records first against various match points to get OCLC numbers in the records. Then the records would be sent on to Datamap. Records where no match was found would be kept in a file. Other option is for datamap to send the file to OCLC after they have completed the processes they do. Ultimate result is that Sirsi gets a better file with better match points to load. File with no match goes back to library for work and then back to Datamap for work on getting ready to load. OCLC is slow in working on these projects. It could really slow down implementation. Sarah has talked to OCLC representative to see if this falls under the group contract. If so it wouldn't cost anything. If it isn't covered, then some of the catalog clean-up money could be used to do this.

Sarah is recommending that we conduct a yearly 035 and catalog merge project. This could help keep OCLC numbers updated in the records and insert them in records that don't have them, wherever possible. We might want to do this now before we hire people to work on this manually.

Deleted: .

Sarah agrees that a regular report for brief titles is a very good idea if we can exclude things for records that should be there (equipment, computers, recirculating collections). The final step would be to hire people to clean-up the catalog.

Deleted: .

Kim asked how we can keep bad records out of the system? Sarah stated that we could have clear steps to substantially reduce this. We could extend the time it takes to add a

Deleted: But Sarah feels that about 75% of the clean-up could be done manually.

Deleted: be very cut and dried about this.

new library. It takes 6 months for libraries that are migrating records. We could require that matching is done with a vendor and only records would be loaded that found a match. It really does lengthen the process. We don't want to scare libraries who want to migrate records. Ann reminded us that you will always have records that don't match. If we have a staff person who can then train libraries on the process, it should help. Claire mentioned that she had Ken send her the post load report for Lincoln County. They had about 11,000 records that were added new to the system. Catalogers have been finding that many of these records do have matches. Jemma mentioned that a save file could be created with the process we have now. The things in the save file might make it that libraries will not have 80% of their collection in the system. Jemma believes that the 80% should be used for all libraries joining, not just retrospective libraries. We could ask Sirsi to not load those without matches. Kim wanted to know what we can do with these records that do not match. Sirsi has already tried several different match points. New libraries might work with their cataloging mentor to fix their records up and try to load them again. Or they could locally pay for a vendor to clean these records up. A library that migrates records may spend time retrospectively cataloging these items. Jemma stated that we can not change how we handle this with these libraries. Roberta agreed that we could not change the process now. We need to load these 2 libraries as is and then have in place, before the next group comes on, what we want the process to be.

The last new libraries will be loaded on November 9, so clean-up could start right after that. Claire asked if Ken was comfortable putting this out now. Ken will use what was used before for a job description. Ken thinks we should do a 035 clean-up before we hire anyone. Roberta reminded everyone that the last 035 project just merged the 035 into the records and that it did not address the issue of duplicates. It needs to be a two step process, the merge and the removal of duplicates. Kim suggested a sub-committee of the Executive Committee to take Jennie's paper and work up a plan.

ACTION – Kim, Roberta, and Jemma will work on this. Ken will wait to hear from the committee before moving forward with hiring.

SPRING MEETING GOALS:

Claire asked if the large meeting room at Bozeman can accommodate all the libraries. Sarah believes it can. Claire asked if it is possible to offer a beginning cataloging training with each meeting? If we are asking libraries to do more with their own records then we need to give them the tools to do this. Ken thought this was a good idea. Ann thinks that this is a good idea and hopes that there will be time for them to ask questions. Jemma also thought it was a good idea. Training would not need to be done by Jemma, there are others in the catalog who can do it. Ken mentioned Carrie Nelson and Janice Kalvig. JoAnne suggested CE credit and an outline of what will be covered, so people don't think it is just cataloging. Training should focus on searching, adding items, batch bib-loads, transferring, etc.

100% attendance – Kim suggested an e-mail reminding people that they should be there. JoAnne thinks we need to remind people that it is in their contract. Claire stated that

handouts are very important for the meeting. She also mentioned that slides for PowerPoint's need to be large enough to read at the back of the room.

Ken asked if he should pursue a speaker from Sirsi/Dynix. Roberta mentioned that the Spring meeting is usually pretty full and suggested that the Fall meeting would be a better time. Ann stated that she thought that this is what we had decided at the last meeting.

ACTION – Ken will work on getting a speaker for the Fall meeting.

RFI DISCUSSION:

Ken is looking for examples. The committee believes that we should keep pursuing it. Ken asked for a time table. Ann suggested that having something within the next 30-60 days would be good. Ken asked if we could have another meeting in January. Kim asked if there was money in the budget to hire a consultant to do this. She thinks it might cost about \$15,000 to do this. Sarah suggested using other State RFI's for a model. All of this has to be sent over to the State Procurement Office for review so lots of people will be looking it over.

Deleted: the RFP

Deleted: Ken said he has already done that. Sarah also has RFI's from the State that could be used.

ACTION-Ken will work on this and have something for us at the January meeting.

MSC MARKETING COMMITTEE:

Ken mentioned that this was something that came out of the fall meeting. The suggestion had been made that the MSC should have its own booth at MEA and MLA. The booth should be staffed by volunteers from MSC Libraries. Claire wasn't sure how many people were in favor of this. Beth thought that a table at MEA would be a good thing to do for outreach to schools. Schools don't have the opportunity for meetings like other types of libraries do. Claire suggested getting a booth box together and then getting it to the person who wants to use it. Sara Groves already does a lot of this. We do not want to duplicate efforts. Ann suggests adding information through OPI K-12 webpage. Ken does not think we need a committee, but some sort of banner or logo that would make the MSC presence more distinct from the rest of the MSL presence. Sarah wondered what SirsiDynix provides for marketing materials. Jemma suggested adding this to the RFI. Claire asked Ken to send out message to MSC-Discuss that we are working on this. Box would be moved around by state library staff.

ACTION-Ken will contact people as they are needed to volunteer. Ken will send out a message to MSC-Discuss that we are working on this.

MSC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION:

Ken brought this up for clarification. This list does not jive with what is in the bylaws. The by-laws state that a large public is one with more than 35,000 bibliographic records. The appendix that deals with Executive Committee representation uses a formula to determine where the libraries fall. We need to make this consistent. Claire asked what the fallout would be from changing the wording in the Appendix to match the by-laws. Bitterroot might change from a large to a small library. Ken will look at this again and we will come back to this at another meeting. Ken asked if county systems need to be

considered as a large public. Sarah did not think that this was necessary. Jemma mentioned that there are a lot of other things that need to be changed in the by-laws. Ken wants to make the changes and present at the fall meeting. The goal is to make the by-laws match Roberts Rules of Order.

[ACTION-Ken will re-look at numbers and we will re-visit this at the next meeting. By-laws need to be changed. Work will continue on this and revised by-laws will be presented for the Fall 2009 meeting.](#)

NACO FUNNEL TRAINING COST:

Sarah gave background on the funnel. Kim suggested that the MSC pay part of the cost for the training. 5 of the 7 libraries are MSC libraries. Kim suggested money coming out reserve funds. Kim moved that we pay for this out of the reserve fund. Ann seconded the motion. Roberta clarified that Kim wanted to pay for the whole cost. She did. Motion passed unanimously.

ACTION

MONTANALIBRARY2GO:

Sarah spoke about the titles purchased for this project. There are 12 MSC libraries in the initial group. A decision needs to be made about how to charge libraries for these items. A batch of records are ready for load. They will load like the NetLibrary titles. They will be easily recognizable using item categories, etc. Kim asked about different ways we could load these records, by creating a virtual library or virtual items. Ann mentioned that she recalled that we discussed that these items would be counted in the future if we put them in the catalog. Not in the next budget but in future budgets. Kim agrees that we need to pay to have the items in the catalog but does not agree with paying for 86 copies of a title, for example a NetLibrary title with 86 holdings, it is really only 1 copy. Ann mentioned that this is why we talked about creating a portal for access for those who do not want to load the bib records. This is going to be an on-going problem with more things being digitized. Individual libraries need to make a decision about what they want to do with these records. Ken wanted to know how the non-MSC libraries are dealing with these. Are they being charged by their vendors for these records? Claire said that if you want the titles in the catalog, then you pay for these titles. Kim said we need to work on a way to get these records in without increasing charges for small libraries.

Sarah will tell libraries that Exec. Com is working on this issue. These items will not be counted for the FY 09 budget.

[ACTION-The Executive Committee needs to work on how this is going to work in the future.](#)

SIRSI SUPERCONFERENCE:

Everyone should send their thoughts to Ken. He will make the final decision based on our input.

ACTION-Ken will decide.

Meeting adjourned at 12:02.